

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 003493.00517 (ATT 2001-0511)

### **REMARKS**

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are unpatentable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

#### **I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 AND 7-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

##### **A. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 16-19, and 22-27**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-11, 16-19, and 22-27 as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,961,416, issued on November 1, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Summers" in view of US Patent 7,006,455, issued on February 28, 2006, hereinafter referred to as "Fandrianto" and in further view of US Patent 6,584,076, issued on June 24, 2003, hereinafter referred to as "Aravamudan." It should be noted that although the Examiner stated in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action that claims 1-4, and 7-31 are rejected in view of Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan, the Examiner only provided substantive rejections for claims 1-4, 7-11, 16-19, and 22-27. As such, the Applicants are presuming that only claims 1-4, 7-11, 16-19, and 22-27 are rejected in view of Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Summers teaches an internet-enabled conferencing system and method accommodating PSTN and IP traffic. A caller may call into a conference call by dialing a number connecting them to a Voice node or VoIP node within a chassis on a TDM bus. (See Summers, column 11, lines 26-65).

Fandrianto teaches a system and method for supporting conferencing capabilities over packet switched networks. Fandrianto teaches that callers may dial into a conference call and be required to enter a conference password for authorization. (See Fandrianto, column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 9).

Aravamudan teaches a telecommunications conferencing method and apparatus. The method and apparatus use a plurality of device servers including a packet circuit gateway. In response to a request for a conference call, the

packet network determines the parties to be on the conference call and selects a conference bridge that results in the lowest cost for the conference call. (See Aravamudan, Abstract).

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or to suggest a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Specifically, Applicants' independent claims 1 and 16 recite:

1. A method for establishing a VoIP conference call by joining a first VoIP station in a communication between a plurality of communication stations, wherein at least one of the plurality of communication stations is a second VoIP station in a private network and said first VoIP station is in the private network, the method comprising:

receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations;

establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station; and  
managing data packet transmission between the first VoIP station and one of the plurality of communication stations. (Emphasis added.)

16. A device for establishing a VoIP conference call by joining a first VoIP station in a communication between a plurality of communication stations, wherein at least one of the plurality of communication stations is a second VoIP station in a private network and said first VoIP station is in the private network, the device comprising:

a receiver for receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a call;

an apparatus for setting up an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station in response to the received signal for joining a call; and,

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 003493.00517 (ATT 2001-0511)

an RTP mixer for managing at least two VoIP stations and sending the mixed data packets to at least one VoIP station. (Emphasis added).

In one embodiment, Applicants' invention is a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. As a result, the Applicants' invention provides conferencing capability in private VoIP networks while containing costs for the VoIP phones. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 6, para. [15]).

The alleged combination (as taught by Summers) fails to teach or suggest a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations. The Examiner concedes this in the Office Action. (See Office Action, page 3, lines 12-15). However, the Examiner then alleges that Fandrianto bridges the substantial gap left by Summers.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Fandrianto fails to bridge the substantial gap left by Summers because Fandrianto also fails to teach or suggest a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network. The Examiner asserts that Fandrianto teaches this limitation because the Examiner interprets "conference password" with the code identifying the connection. (See Office Action, page 3, lines 18-19). The Applicants respectfully submit that a conference password is not the same as a code identifying a connection. For example, a conference password merely authorizes a party to join a call. (See Fandrianto, Column 7, line 66 – Column 8, line 5) The conference password, unlike the code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network taught by the Applicants' invention, does not identify an existing connection of another party.

Moreover, Summers fails to teach or to suggest establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. The Examiner concedes this in the Office Action. (See Office Action, page 4, lines 9-10). However, the Examiner then alleges that Aravamudan bridges the substantial gap left by Summers.

Aravamudan fails to bridge the substantial gap left by Summers because Aravamudan also fails to teach or suggest establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. Aravamudan only teaches establishing an RTP over circuits 119. (See Aravamudan, col. 6, ll. 25-34). Notably, circuits 119 only establish a path between the device servers and call coordinator. (See Aravamudan, FIGs. 1-3). Aravamudan does not teach or suggest that RTP is used on the circuits that establish a path to the devices. (See Aravamudan, col. 6, ll. 35-40). Unlike Aravamudan, the Applicants' invention teaches establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. Moreover, Aravamudan also fails to teach or suggest receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations.

Therefore, Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or suggest a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station, as positively recited by Applicants' independent claims 1 and 16. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-4, 7-11, 17-19, and 22-27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 16, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 7-11, 17-19, and 22-27 are also patentable

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 003493.00517 (ATT 2001-0511)

over Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 12-15 and 28-31**

The Examiner rejected claims 12-15 and 28-31 as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Fandrianto and Aravamudan and in further view of US Patent 6,269,159, issued on July 31, 2001, hereinafter referred to as "Cannon." The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The teachings of Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan have been discussed above. Cannon teaches conferencing with a calling party. The method and apparatus provides three way conferencing which allows a third party caller to call into an existing telephone call at a single line of a called party's telephone. (See Cannon, Abstract.)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that the alleged combination (as taught by Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan) fails to disclose the novel a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 16. (See *supra*).

The Applicants' invention teaches a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. In contrast, as discussed above, the combination of Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan simply does not teach or suggest the novel method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 003493.00517 (ATT 2001-0511)

connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station.

Moreover, Cannon does not bridge the substantial gap left by Summers, Fandrianto and Aravamudan because Cannon also fails to teach or suggest a method or apparatus for establishing a VoIP conference call comprising receiving an indication comprising a code number identifying a connection associated with the second VoIP station in the private network from the first VoIP station in the private network for joining a VoIP call between the plurality of communication stations and establishing an RTP voice path with the first VoIP station. Cannon only teaches a method and apparatus for conferencing with a calling party. (See Cannon, Abstract). Thus, for all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1 and 16 of the present invention are not made obvious by the combination of Summers, Fandrianto, Aravamudan and Cannon.

Furthermore, dependent claims 12-15 and 28-31 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 16, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 12-15 and 28-31 are also patentable and not made obvious by the teachings of Summers, Fandrianto, Aravamudan and Cannon. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq.


PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. 003493.00517 (ATT 2001-0511)

at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 1, 2007

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

  
Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400  
(732) 530-9404